

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

CCP(S) No. 249/2024 in
WP(C) No. 2079/2023

Surinder Mohan Gupta

.....Petitioner(s)

Through: Ms. Arsha Sharma, Advocate

Vs

Shaleen Kabra Commissioner Secretary Jal
Shakti Department Jammu and others

..... Respondent(s)

Through: Ms. Priyanka Bhat, Assisting Counsel to
Mrs. Monika Kohli, Sr. AAG

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE WASIM SADIQ NARGAL, JUDGE

ORDER
26.08.2025

01. The instant contempt petition arises out of the order/judgment dated 11.08.2023 passed in WP(C) No. 2079/2023, by virtue of which the writ petition was disposed of at the very threshold with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner as projected in the writ petition and take a decision thereon within a period of two weeks from the date a certified copy of that order is furnished by the petitioner to them, subject to verification of the requisite bills.
02. Since the aforesaid order was not complied with by the respondents within the time granted by this Court, which led to filing of the instant contempt petition in which notice was issued on 05.08.2024.
03. Record reveals that the compliance report stands filed by respondent No.2- Chief Engineer, Jal Shakti, Ravi Tawi Irrigation Complex, Jammu on 15.04.2025, however, the same is not on the record. Copy of the same has

been furnished to this Court, which has been taken on record, a perusal whereof reveals that the works were undertaken illegally by the then Executive Engineer without following proper codal procedure in vogue at that relevant time, which constitutes a gross violation of rules and there were gross procedural lapses and violations of codal formalities as well, for which the department also intends to take disciplinary action against the concerned officers responsible for these irregularities in accordance with the rules and regulations governing service conduct.

04. The claim submitted by the petitioner has been found to be without merit and stood rejected by virtue of a speaking order No. 50-E of 2025 dated 12.04.2025, which has been placed on record along with the compliance report.
05. Heard learned counsel for the parties and also perused the speaking order dated 12.04.2025 issued by the respondents.
06. Since the direction passed by the learned Writ Court was specific to the extent of according consideration to the case of the petitioner by taking a decision within the specified period and the writ petition was disposed of at the very threshold and the respondents in furtherance of the aforesaid order have accorded due consideration by passing a detailed consideration order thereby rejecting the case of the petitioner, as such, this Court after perusing the aforesaid order is of the view that the order/judgment passed by the writ Court stands complied with. Thus, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping this contempt petition alive.
07. Therefore, in the light of the order passed by the respondents dated 12.04.2025, the proceedings in the contempt petition are closed. Rule, if

any, shall stand discharged. However, petitioner is at liberty to challenge the order of rejection (supra) by way of appropriate remedy, if so advised.

(Wasim Sadiq Nargal)
Judge

Jammu
26.08.2025
Vijay

